

REMARKS

This Amendment is filed in response to the Final Action of February 1, 2010, 2009 in which claims 1, 2, 6-22, 24-31, 64, 68-85 and 88-91 were rejected.

Independent claims

The Examiner considered the previously submitted arguments not to be persuasive. It is requested to reconsider this estimation.

a) Claim 1 requires "*receiving a content of an RFID tag of said at least one other of said electronic devices*". The Examiner repeated that the test is not whether the art uses the express term of the claim but whether the art teaches the same structure and function of the limitation. In the present case, there is not just a difference in term but a different structure and function. As pointed out before, an RFID tag is well known by a person of ordinary skill in the art to store content itself. The indication "content of an RFID tag" in claim 1 also defines in the claim itself that the RFID tag has to store content. This is a function that is not disclosed by the connections of *Libes* or *Peters*.

b) Claim 1 relates to a method of creating an ad-hoc connection between at least two electronic devices. Further, one of the electronic devices is able to receive content of an RFID tag of another electronic device. Further, a communication channel is established between electronic devices based on information that is provided by one device to the other. In a reasonable interpretation of this claim, the mentioned electronic devices are thus separate devices and not components of a single further device.

If claim 1 thus requires at a first electronic device "*receiving a content of a radio frequency identification tag of said at least one other of said electronic devices*" and that "*said handle is obtained by retrieving a stored address to which said received content of said RFID tag is mapped*" at the first electronic device, it is clear that the content of the RFID tag cannot be considered to be provided by an internal

application of the first electronic device. Rather, it is provided by an external source, namely the other electronic device.

*Peters*, in contrast, only suggests mapping content (=host name) provided by a local application to a remote IP address (col. 8, lines 50-55), not content that is provided by another electronic device. In *Peters*, the use of the table is thus not triggered by external content, but only the creation of the table.

There is no incentive to a person of ordinary skill in the art in view of *Libes* to map externally provided information to a lookup table as stored in *Peters*. The Examiner considers the incentive to be the aim to improve dynamic address handling in communications. However, in *Libes* this would not appear to be necessary, since *Libes* does not suggest using the content of an RFID tag as information. A person of ordinary skill in the art will rather understand e.g. Fig. 10 of *Libes* such that a device according to *Libes* as such is able to provide any information - including dynamically updated address information for the device whenever a new connection is desired.

Thus, claim 1 is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by the cited references.

The same applies to the other independent claims, which comprise corresponding features.

#### Dependent claims

The dependent claims are new and non-obvious already due to their reference to a respective new and non-obvious independent claim. In addition, they comprise inventive features of their own.

For example, **claim 9** requires "*monitoring conditions on said established communication channel and updating said communication channel in case said conditions are detected to be worse than predetermined conditions*". According to the features of claim 1, which belong to claim 9 by reference, the communication

channel of claim 9 is established using information received directly from another device.

The features of claim 9 are considered to be disclosed by *Libes* in paragraphs [41] and [45]. In *Libes*, there is an exchange of handshake data (par. 41). After the handshake plugs have been disconnected, a wireless connection may be established (par. 45). Thus, the handshake connection might at the most be considered to correspond to a connection for directly receiving of information from another device in line with claim 1, and the wireless connection might be considered to correspond at the most to the established communication channel of claims 1 and 9.

There is no indication in *Libes*, however, that the conditions on the established wireless connection is monitored, or that the connection is updated in case the conditions are detected to be worse than predetermined conditions. As can be seen as well in Fig. 21 and 22, to which par. 45 of *Libes* relates, the only action that is performed after the action "the two devices establish a wireless connection" is a "connection notification" (and in Fig. 22 the delayed disconnection of the devices wireless handshake plugs). Thus, a monitoring of the established communication channel cannot possibly be considered to be disclosed or rendered obvious.

The objections and rejections of the Office Action of July 10, 2009, having been obviated by amendment or shown to be inapplicable, withdrawal thereof is requested and passage of amended claims 1-2, 6-22, 24-31, 64, 68-85, and 88-91 to issue, is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

/Francis J. Maguire/

Francis J. Maguire  
Attorney for the Applicant  
Registration No. 31,391

FJM/mo  
WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS  
& ADOLPHSON LLP  
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224  
Monroe, Connecticut 06468  
(203) 261-1234  
Customer No. 004955